

Date of Deposit: October 5, 2007

101769-310-WCG
9500Hear202026t

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicants : Thilo DOLLASE, et al.
Serial No. : 10/537,469
Filed : January 18, 2006
For : SELF-ADHESIVE ARTICLE
Art Unit : 1771
Examiner : Victor S. Chang

October 5, 2007

Mail Stop Amendment
Hon. Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

RESPONSE TO RESTRICTION REQUIREMENT

Sir:

In response to the Restriction Requirement dated September 13, 2007,
Applicants elect the invention of Category A, subgroup a (i.e., P(A)-P(B)-P(A)) and
Category B, subgroup a (i.e., pad of sheets), with traverse.

The claims which read on the elected species are claims 1-6 and 8-11

The Examiner has imposed an election requirement between block copolymers

- a) P(A)-P(B)-P(A),
- b) P(B)-P(A)-(PB) and
- c) P(A)-P(B)-P(A) and P(B)-P(A)-(PB)

as well as between

d) a pad of sheets and

e) a strip.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the restriction requirement is respectfully requested. Any search of either one of the block copolymers is certain to include a search of the other, as well as a combination of the two, and any search of a pressure-sensitive article in the form of a pad of sheet is certain to include a search of the pressure-sensitive article in the form of a strip rolled onto a core. Accordingly, no additional burden would be placed on the Patent Office in searching all of the denoted groups together. By contrast, a very great burden will be placed on Applicants if this election/restriction requirement is maintained. Applicants will be subjected to several times the cost and effort in prosecuting several patent applications for an invention that should have been included in one, and will also be subjected to the continuing expense of maintaining several separate patents, whereas only one should be required to cover the full invention.

In addition, an additional burden will be placed on the public, in that the full scope of Applicants' invention will not be ascertainable from a single patent, and the public will have to find and study several patents to ascertain the full scope of Applicants' exclusive rights.

The great additional burden that will be placed on Applicants and the public in maintaining the restriction requirement is far greater than the slight, if any, effort that will be required of the Patent Office in withdrawing the Restriction Requirement.

It is therefore respectfully requested that the Restriction Requirement be withdrawn.

In the event that the Examiner does not find it possible to withdraw the Restriction Requirement, it is respectfully requested that the non-elected subject matter be rejoined with the elected subject matter upon allowance of elected subject matter.

CONDITIONAL PETITION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME

If any extension of time for this response is required, applicant requests that this be considered a petition therefor. Please charge the required Petition fee to Deposit Account No. 14-1263.

ADDITIONAL FEE

Please charge any insufficiency of fees, or credit any excess to our Deposit Account No. 14-1263.

Respectfully submitted

NORRIS, McLAUGHLIN & MARCUS

By /William C. Gerstenzang/
William C. Gerstenzang
Reg. No. 27,552

WCG/tmo

875 Third Avenue
18th Floor
New York, New York 10022
(212) 808-0700